

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

The Abstract of the disclosure was objected to because of superfluous language.

By the instant amendment, the original Abstract has been cancelled, and a new Abstract has been provided.

It is respectfully submitted that the new Abstract is free from superfluous language.

Claim 2 and apparently Claims 18 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

These rejections are traversed in part.

Claim 2 has been amended to take into consideration the helpful comments of the Examiner.

With respect to Claim 18, the Examiner's suggestion is appreciated, but Applicants respectfully submit that this suggestion is directed to claim breath, and the original Claim 18 is in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

With respect to Claim 25, this claim has been amended to take into consideration the helpful comments of the Examiner.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-28 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and particularly points out and distinctly claims the presently claimed invention.

Turning now to the art rejections, Claims 1-3, 13-15, 18, 19, 23, 25, 26, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over McGrath.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that McGrath does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the second digital filter having a second settling rate that is slower than the first settling rate and a second level of noise resolution that is higher than the first level of noise resolution in the various forms in independent Claims 1, 13, and 25.

Applicants agree with the Examiner as evidence by page 3 of the Office Action that McGrath does not disclose the claim settling rate and noise resolution features.

The Examiner alleges that these aspects are obvious; however, if the Examiner persists in this rejection, a teaching from the prior art is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the indication that if Claims 4-12, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 27 and 28 were rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, that these claims would be allowable.

By the instant amendment, Claims 4-6, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 20-22, 27 and 28 have been placed in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5633

TI-32746 - 22 -